



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/568,220

02/14/2006

Young Jin Doh

9988.300.00

6259

30827

7590

03/05/2009

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3743

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/05/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/568,220	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DOH, YOUNG JIN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Stephen M. Gravini	<b>Art Unit</b> 3743	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 February 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claimed “supporting protrusion” is construed to be new matter because originally filed specification and drawings show protrusion **231** as protruding from securing member **230** but not supporting the convex portion as claimed. Specification page 5, beginning on line 40 discusses a protrusion, but not in such a way that it would reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3743

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deaton (US 3,718,982) in view of Toma et al. (US 4,817,297). The claims are reasonably and broadly construed, in light of the accompanying specification, to be disclosed by Deaton as comprising:

a door **36**;

a lint filter **82** including a filter housing **88** installed at a rear of the door and a filter main body **90** inserted into the filter housing; and

at least one securing member **92** for securing the filter main body to the filter housing. Deaton also discloses the claimed guide rail formed therein for guiding the filter main body therein as shown in figure 2, wherein the securing member is formed at a bottom portion of the guide rail as shown in figure 3, wherein the securing member is formed perpendicularly to the guide rail as shown in figure 1, wherein the securing member includes a convexing portion convexing from one end for contacting a periphery of the filter main body, and a supporting protrusion for supporting the convexing portion and wherein the convexing portion has a predetermined elasticity as shown in figure 3, wherein the filter main body is pressed firmly by the securing member

Art Unit: 3743

against a rear of the filter housing at column 3 lines 5-41, wherein the convexing portion convexes towards the supporting protrusion when the filter main body is inserted into the filter housing, and the convexing portion readopts an original shape when the filter main body is pulled out from the filter housing as shown in figure 3, wherein the convexing portion has a deformation degree limited by the supporting protrusion as shown in figure 2. Deaton discloses the invention as claimed, except for the claimed feature wherein the securing member includes a convex portion configured to contact the filter main body, and a supporting protrusion spaced away from the convex portion to support the convex portion when the filter main body is seated in the filter housing. Toma, another dryer assembly, discloses that feature at column 4 lines 11-40 and shown in figure 4. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Deaton with the securing member features of Toma, for the purpose of providing a secure convex assembly with respect dryer.

Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox (US 3,648,381) in view of Toma. The claims are reasonably and broadly construed, in light of the accompanying specification, to be disclosed by Fox as comprising:

- a door **40**;

- a filter main body **54** including a mesh **76** and a frame **56** on an outer periphery of the wire mesh; and

- a filter housing **64** disposed at a rear of the door, and having a guide rail for guiding an insertion **70** of the filter main body into the filter housing; and

a pressing member **66** protruding at a right angle to the guide rail. Fox also discloses the claimed frame pressed firmly against a rear of the filter housing by the pressing member when inserted therein as shown in figure 3, wherein the guide rail guides each side of the frame as shown in figure 2, wherein the filter main body inserts into the filter housing from a top or a side as shown in figure 1, wherein the frame has a handle **58** on an upper portion thereof for a user to grasp, wherein the pressing member protrudes in a direction so that the pressing member presses the filter main body against a rear of the filter housing as shown in figure 3. Fox discloses the invention as claimed, except for the claimed feature wherein the pressing member configured to protrude from the guiding rail toward the filter main body, and push the filter main body toward the filter housing. Toma, another dryer assembly, discloses that feature at column 4 lines 11-40 and shown in figure 4. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Fox with the protruding configuration features of Toma, for the purpose of providing a guide assembly with respect dryer.

### ***Double Patenting***

Claims 1-4 and 6-15 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of copending Application No. 11/938,949. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide the lint filter to the copending application since both inventions perform the functions as claimed regardless of the lint filter.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot-in-part in view of the partial new grounds of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References cited with this action disclose one or more feature of the claimed invention, but are not currently relied upon in rejecting the claims.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3743

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272 4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth B. Rinehart can be reached on 571 272 4881. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen Gravini/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3743